27

28

Page 1 of 11 Page ID #:1

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under Sections 16(c) and 17 of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. §§ 216(c), 217. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1331 (federal question) and 28 U.S.C. § 1345 (United States as plaintiff).
- 2. Venue lies in the United States District Court for the Central District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the events giving rise to the claims in this enforcement action occurred within this District.

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

- 3. The Acting Secretary of Labor brings this action under Sections 16(c) and 17 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 216(c), 217, to recover unpaid back wages and liquidated damages owed to caregivers who worked more than forty hours per week in Defendants' residential care facilities without overtime compensation and to enjoin Defendants from committing future violations of the Act.
- 4. In bringing this action, the Acting Secretary represents not only the interests of individual workers harmed by violations of the Act, but also the public interest in enforcement of the FLSA.

#### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff Julie A. Su, the Acting Secretary of Labor (the "Acting Secretary"), United States Department of Labor, is charged with enforcing the FLSA to eliminate "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers[.]" 29 U.S.C. § 202(a).

### **Corporate Defendants**

6. Defendant Tolentino & Tolentino Partners is a partnership doing business as Howard Home with a principal place of business at 4361 Howard St.,

Montclair, CA 91763. Defendant Tolentino & Partners dba Howard Home operates a residential care facility for adults with developmental disabilities at this address and employs caregivers at this facility. At all relevant times, Defendant Tolentino & Tolentino Partners dba Howard Home has been an employer within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(d), 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

- 7. Defendant Aizabel Home, Inc. is a corporation with a principal place of business at 1425 Ethel St., Glendale, CA 91207. Defendant Aizabel Home, Inc. operates a residential care facility for adults with developmental disabilities at this address and employs caregivers at this facility. At all relevant times, Defendant Aizabel Home, Inc. has been an employer within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(d), 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 8. Defendant Alyza Home, Inc. is a corporation with a principal place of business at 5062 Rodeo St., Montclair, CA 91763. Defendant Alyza Home, Inc. operates a residential care facility for adults with developmental disabilities at this address and employs caregivers at this facility. At all relevant times, Defendant Alyza Home, Inc. has been an employer within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(d), 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 9. Defendant Gala Home, Inc. is a corporation which had a principal place of business at 10986 S. Gala Lane, Ontario, CA 91762. Defendant Gala Home, Inc. operated a residential care facility for adults with developmental disabilities at this address and employed caregivers at this facility. At all relevant times, Defendant Gala Home, Inc. was an employer within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(d), 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 10. Defendant Gypsum Creek Homes, Inc. is a corporation with a principal place of business at 14572 Sleepy Creek Dr., Eastvale, CA 92880.Defendant Gypsum Creek Homes, Inc. operates a residential care facility for adults

1 | w
2 | fa
3 | fa
4 | E
5 | D

with developmental disabilities at this address and employs caregivers at this facility. Defendant Gyspum Creek Homes, Inc. also operated a residential care facility for adults with developmental disabilities at 6976 Gypsum Creek Dr., Eastvale, CA 92880 and employed caregivers at this facility. At all relevant times, Defendant Gypsum Creek Homes, Inc. has been an employer within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(d), 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

#### **Individual Defendants**

- 11. Defendant Maria Lilian Tolentino is an individual residing in Ontario, California. Defendant Maria Lilian Tolentino operates a residential care facility doing business as Gala Home at 10986 S. Gala Lane, Ontario, CA 91762. At all relevant times, Defendant Maria Lilian Tolentino, together with the other Individual Defendants, has also jointly controlled the operations of the residential care facilities operated by Defendants. Defendant Maria Lilian Tolentino is an employer within the meaning of Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 12. Defendant Judy Tolentino is an individual residing in Walnut, California. At all relevant times, Defendant Judy Tolentino, together with the other Individual Defendants, has jointly controlled the operations of the residential care facilities operated by Defendants. Defendant Judy Tolentino is an employer within the meaning of Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 13. Defendant Ramon Tolentino is an individual residing in Walnut, California. At all relevant times, Defendant Ramon Tolentino, together with the other Individual Defendants, has jointly controlled the operations of the residential care facilities operated by Defendants. Defendant Ramon Tolentino is an employer within the meaning of Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 14. Defendant Angeles Marquez is an individual residing in Chino, California. At all relevant times, Defendant Angeles Marquez, together with the

other Individual Defendants, has jointly controlled the operations of the residential care facilities operated by Defendants. Defendant Angeles Marquez is an employer within the meaning of Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

#### **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS**

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendants jointly controlled and operated residential care facilities for the common business purpose of providing for-profit caregiving services.
- 16. At all relevant times, Defendants' residential care facilities had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000.
- 17. At all relevant times, Defendants employed caregivers, including the individuals listed in Exhibit A, who worked at their residential care facilities.
- 18. At all relevant times, two or more of the caregiver employees who worked in Defendants' residential care facilities handled products made outside of California and transported into the State.
- 19. From at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, Defendants' caregiver employees, including the individuals listed in Exhibit A, regularly worked more than 40 hours per week.
- 20. From at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, Defendants failed to pay overtime at the required rate of time-and-a-half for the overtime hours that their caregiver employees worked. Instead, Defendants paid caregiver employees a fixed amount each month, regardless of their hours worked. Additionally, Defendants incorrectly classified some caregivers as independent contractors.
- 21. From at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, Defendants failed to keep accurate records of the hours worked by their caregiver employees and the wages paid to them.

#### **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

#### **First Cause of Action**

#### Violation of the Overtime Provisions of the FLSA

- 22. The Acting Secretary incorporates all facts alleged above.
- 23. Defendants' residential care facilities are an "enterprise," within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(r)(1), 29 U.S.C. § 203(r)(1).
- 24. At all relevant times, Defendants' enterprise has been engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of FLSA Section 3(s)(1)(A), 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(A).
- 25. From at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, Defendants willfully violated the overtime provisions of FLSA Sections 7(a) and 15(a)(2), 29 U.S.C. §§ 207(a), 215(a)(2), by employing the caregiver employees at their residential care facilities for workweeks longer than forty hours without compensating the employees for hours worked in excess of forty at rates not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which they were employed. Defendants knew or should have known of the FLSA's overtime requirements but suffered or permitted their employees to work without properly compensating them.

## **Second Cause of Action**

## Violation of the Recordkeeping Provisions of the FLSA

- 26. The Acting Secretary incorporates all facts alleged above.
- 27. From at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, Defendants violated the recordkeeping provisions of FLSA Sections 11(c) and 15(a)(5), 29 U.S.C. §§ 211(c), 215(a)(5), by failing to make, keep, and preserve accurate records of the hours worked by their employees and the wages paid to them as prescribed by the Acting Secretary of Labor's regulations at 29 C.F.R. Part 516.

3

56

8

7

1011

1213

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

28. Defendants failed to create and maintaine accurate and complete records of caregivers' hours worked and wages paid, even though they knew or should have known that this conduct violates the FLSA.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The Acting Secretary prays for a judgment and order providing the following relief:

- A. a permanent injunction restraining Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, successors, and persons acting in active concert or participation with them from violating the and recordkeeping provisions of FLSA Sections 7(a), 11(c), 15(a)(2), and 15(a)(5), 29 U.S.C. 207(a), 211(c), 215(a)(2), and 215(a)(5), under FLSA Section 17, 29 U.S.C. § 217;
- B. a judgment under FLSA Section 16(c), 29 U.S.C. § 216(c), finding Defendants jointly and severally liable for the unpaid overtime compensation due to Defendants' current and former employees, for the period from at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages;
- C. if liquidated damages are not awarded, an order under FLSA Section 17, 29 U.S.C. § 217, enjoining Defendants from withholding payment of unpaid overtime compensation found due to Defendants' current and former employees for the period from at least March 7, 2021 to March 6, 2024, plus pre-judgment interest at an appropriate interest rate;
- D. an award to Plaintiff of the costs of this action; and
- E. any other relief that is necessary or appropriate.

1	Dated: January 10, 2025	Respectfully submitted,
2 3		SEEMA NANDA
4		Solicitor of Labor
5		MARC A. PILOTIN
6		Regional Solicitor
7		KATHERINE E. CAMERON
8		Associate Regional Solicitor
9		/s/ Tara Stearns
0		TARA STEARNS
11		Senior Trial Attorney
12		
13		
4		
15		
l6 l7		
18		
9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

## EXHIBIT A

1

28

2		First Name	Last Name	
3	1.	ACELITA DEL	ALCAZAR	
	2.	ANGELES	MARQUEZ	
4	3.	ANNIE ROSE	INCISO	
5	4.	ANTHONY	FONG	
	5.	APHOL JAY	SALVADOR	
6	6.	ARMANDO	ALCALA	
7	7.	ARMANDO	TONGOL	
8	8.	ASTERIA	PAREDES	
	9.	AURI BLAY N	OQUISUMBING	
9	10.	BRENDA	REBOLLEDO	
10	10 11. BRUCE NICHOLE JOHN VERGARA		VERGARA	
11	12.	CARLITO	TAN JR	
	13.	CHRISTIAN	REYES	
12	14.	CHRISTIENE	ESTREMUS	
13	15.	DANERICK	APELADO	
14	16.	DANILO	MANALO	
	17.	DARYL	ALVAREZ	
15	18.	DIONISIO	ESTEVES	
16	19.	EDGARDO	SANTOS	
17	20.	EDUARDO	BULIWAN	
	21.	EDWARD BLAY	VELASQUEZ	
18	22.	EUGENE	SUPNET	
19	23.	EVELYN	MACNI	
20	24.	FADHI	SALVADOR	
·	25.	FERMIN JASON	AGRISOLA II	
21	26.	FRANCIS	PASTORFIDE	
22	27.	FRANCISCO	CAUBALEJO	
	28.	GENEMAR	MONZAGA	
23	29.	GENESIS	FRANCIA	
24	30.	GLORIA	TROPICALES	
25	31.	GUILLERMA	PAREDES	
	32.	JAMES	BLANCO	
26	33.	JEAN PAUL	BUNDALIAN	
27	34.	JEFFREN	MUNGCAL	

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT Case No. 5:25-cv-73

	l ,			
1	35.	JERRYSON	MANI	
_	36.	JESSIE	BORRES	
2	37.	JESUS	SARMIENTO JR	
3	38.	JONATHAN	SAMONTE	
4	39.	JOSELITO	EMRALINO	
	40.	JUDELIZA	PASTORFIDE	
5	41.	KARL LEO	BELTRAN	
6	42.	KENNETH	TAN	
7	43.	LIEZL DE	GUZMAN	
/	44.	LYNBETH	CARLOS	
8	45.	MA VICTORIA	BORRES	
9	46. MANOLITO JOSE		JOSE	
10	47.	MARCIAL	FERNANDO	
10	48.	MARGARITA	CAUBALEJO	
11	49.	MARIA GOLDA	MEDIANTE	
12	50.	MARIA MARIAN	MABUHAY	
	51.	MARIA ROSARIO	SAMONTE	
13	52.	MARIAN JUDITH ISABEL	MANAOG	
14	53.	MARIO	FIGURACION JR	
15	54.	MARISSA	CARREON	
55. MARLON BAGUIN	BAGUINO			
16	56. MAURA PANGANIBAN		PANGANIBAN	
17	57.	57. MICHAELA FERRER		
10	58. NOEL PANGANIBAN		PANGANIBAN	
18 59. PATRICE ANTHONY AMON		AMON		
19	60.	RAMON	OBLIGACION	
20	61.	RENATO	PAREDES	
	62.	RODELIO	MARQUEZ	
21	63.	RODOLFO	CABIGTING	
22	64.	ROSELLE MAY	TAN	
23	65.	ROY	DURANGPARANG	
	66.	RUDOLFO	CABIGTING	
24	67.	RUDY	SANTOS	
25	68.	SHAIRA	EVANGELIO	
26	69.	SHELLA MAE	ABELLO	
	70.	SONNY	BARBATO	
27				

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT Case No. 5:25-cv-73

	71.	STINELI	CHAVEZ
	72.	TERESITA	TONGOL
	73.	VENUS	SISON
	74.	VIRGILIO	BUGNOT
	75.	VIRGINIA	BURON
	76.	WILFREDO	SINGUEO
	77.	WILLIAM	CARREON
	78.	XANTIPPE	BORJA
- 1 1			

COMPLAINT FOR	R VIOLATIONS OF TH	HE FAIR LABOR	STANDARDS A	кСТ
Case No. 5:25-cv-7	3			